

REMARKS

In the present patent application, claims 1-20 were presented for examination. Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6, 8, 12-15, 18 and cancelled claims 9, 10, 11, 16, 19 and 20. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicant has amended the claims to more succinctly claim particular aspects of the invention. Support for the amendments is found in the specification and the original claims. Accordingly, applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Applicant has cancelled claims 9, 10, 11, 16, 19 and 20. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 9, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are now moot.

Claim 6 was objected to because there was no antecedent basis in the parent claim for conductive particles. Independent claim 1 from which claim 6 depends was amended to include the words "conductive particles. Accordingly, the objection to claim 6 is now moot.

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Boskamp (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0206017).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites in part: " a gradient tube extending along an axis, the tube including first and second gradient coils and a conductive compound disposed between the first and second gradient coils, the conductive compound being a glue having a plurality of conductive particles therein, at least a portion of the plurality of conductive particles being in a range of 1-10µm in diameter, the plurality of conductive particles configured to limit a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue."

Referring to Boskamp, the reference is directed to a magnetic resonance imaging system. Boskamp, however, does not provide any teaching of : "the tube including first and second gradient coils and a conductive compound disposed between the first and second gradient coils, the conductive compound being a glue having a plurality of conductive particles therein, at least

a portion of the plurality of conductive particles being in a range of 1-10 μ m in diameter, the plurality of conductive particles configured to limit a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, because Boskamp does not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over this reference.

Independent claim 13, as amended, recites in part: "disposing a conductive compound between the first gradient coil and a second gradient coil, the conductive compound being a glue having a plurality of conductive particles therein, at least a portion of the plurality of conductive particles being in a range of 1-10 μ m in diameter, the plurality of conductive particles configured to limit a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than a predetermined value to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue, the conductive compound further having a chemical hardening compound therein."

Referring to Boskamp, the reference does not provide any teaching of : "disposing a conductive compound between the first gradient coil and a second gradient coil, the conductive compound being a glue having a plurality of conductive particles therein, at least a portion of the plurality of conductive particles being in a range of 1-10 μ m in diameter, the plurality of conductive particles configured to limit a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than a predetermined value to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue, the conductive compound further having a chemical hardening compound therein", as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, because Boskamp does not teach each and every limitation of claim 13, applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over this reference.

Claims 2, 3, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Kuth (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0121965).

Statement Concerning Common Ownership

The present application serial number 10/707,907 and Boskamp (U.S. Patent Application No. 10/138,858) were, at the time the invention of application serial number 10/707,907 was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to GE Medical Systems Global Technology Company, LLC.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Thus, applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 15, 17 are allowable over the combination of Boskamp and Kuth.

Claims 4 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Kuth and further in view of Damadian (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,711). As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 4 is allowable over the combination of Boskamp and Kuth and Damadian.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Kuth and further in view of Lehne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,283). As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 5 is allowable over the combination of Boskamp, Kuth and Lehne et al.

Claims 6, 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Kuth. As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 6, 7 and 18 are allowable over the combination of Boskamp and Kuth.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Kuth and further in view of Damadian. As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable over the combination of Boskamp, Kuth, and Damadian.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Dean et al. As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 12 is allowable over the combination of Boskamp and Dean et al.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Boskamp in view of Lehne et al. As discussed above, Boskamp is disqualified as a reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 14 is allowable over the combination of Boskamp and Lehne et al.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Such action is most earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

If there are any charges due with respect to this response document or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0845.

Respectfully Submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 
John F. Buckert
Registration No. 44,572

Date: April 18, 2007
Cantor Colburn, LLP
248-524-2300 ext. 3109
248-524-2700 (fax)